

Appl. No. 09/943,848

Reply to Office Action of July 02, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 19-21 as being indefinite for claim 19 being dependent upon itself, claim 19 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 18. Claims 19-21, as amended, now contains proper antecedent basis and this rejection should be withdrawn.

In regard to the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1-12 over Reinhardt (U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,565), the Reinhardt patent teaches a power control scheme for a flat panel display screen, col. 1 lines 64-67. However, applicant's presently claimed solution is distinct to the localized solution of the cited art.

The patent of Reinhardt teaches one embodiment to keep full power to a select subset of pixels even when reduced power mode is engaged, col. 2 lines 1-4. In another embodiment, the user can manually request a section of the display use full power, col. 2 lines 16-21. The power management system is identified as element 195 and control power distribution to certain pixels, col. 4 lines 18-21. Among the choices to reduce display power is reducing

Appl. No. 09/943,848

Reply to Office Action of July 02, 2003

refresh rate, col. 4 lines 29-33 and col. 7 lines 26-28; user initiated power control, col. 4 lines 55-60; prioritization of pixel content, col. 4 line 65 through col. 5 line 2, where software can determine pixel priority, col. 5 lines 4-9, and further expanded in col. 5 lines 22-32.

Reinhardt does not teach the external network interface power control of the presently claimed invention. Examiner's reference, in rejection of claim 4, to the broad reading of the "operating system" in CPU connected to a bus reading on a "communication network" is obviated by presently claimed invention, where the communications network is external to the LCD device, and supported in the original disclosure on page 4 lines 1-4, page 7 lines 12-17 and page 15 lines 13-22.

Claims 2-12 are dependent upon claim 1 and incorporate the limitations therein.

In light of applicant's amended claim language, and Reinhardt's failure to teach any external communications network to activate power conserving mode, claims 1-12 are deemed allowable over the cited patent of Reinhardt, and the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/943,848
Reply to Office Action of July 02, 2003

In regard to the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of present claims 13-16 and 18-21, as being anticipated by Rader (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,140), Rader teaches a reduced display area to conserve power, col. 2 lines 23-27 and col. 7 lines 50-53. Activation of sleep mode is in response to sensor input, col. 3 lines 44-52. Rader does not teach presently claimed network signals to enter power conservation mode. Rader's only reference to a network is found in passage starting in col. 3 line 64 and spanning col. 4 line 3, where the portable communication device includes RF circuitry 318 and antenna 106 to provide wireless communication with a base station within a network. No teaching, suggestion or inference is made to send a signal for power conservation mode over such a network. Examiner's rejection of claim 16 alleges the passage at col. 3 lines 40-44 presents network signaling, but this passage refers to an internal sensor in the CPU to activate sleep mode for the display. No teaching of network signal is present within the passage of col. 3 lines 40-44 of Rader.

Consequently, the rejection of claims 13-16 and 18-21, as being anticipated by Rader, should be withdrawn in light of amended claims language and response presented herein.

Attorney Docket Number - NC_25858

Appl. No. 09/943,848

Reply to Office Action of July 02, 2003

Applicant graciously acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter for claim 17. Independent claims 1,10 and 13 have been presently amended to clarify the external communication network requirement.

Accordingly, present claims 1-13 and 15-21 are believed to be in allowable form having overcome all existing rejections set forth within the office action of July 2, 2003. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims and issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas R. Weber
Reg. No. 41,547
October 24, 2003